



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SANDALWOOD AND PEACOCKS OF OPHIR

BY WALTER EUGENE CLARK
University of Chicago

This short paper deals with the general problem of Ophir only in so far as that problem has a bearing on the more specific question of commercial relations between India and the West in the tenth century B.C. For my purpose it is unnecessary to discuss the words *šenhabbīm* and *qophīm*, usually translated 'ivory' and 'apes.' The words may have those meanings or they may not. Even if they are accurately translated, India is not the only country from which ivory and apes could have come. Only the words 'sandalwood' and 'peacocks' are crucial. It is also unnecessary to discuss the much-disputed 'ships of Tharshish' and to decide whether the phrase is merely metaphorical or whether it really refers to ships which sailed to Tharshish, as the Chronicler would have it. It is immaterial for my purpose whether there was one voyage to Ophir or many, and whether the ships sailed to Ophir alone or to both Ophir and Tharshish.

All the facts here stated have long been known, but many recent books and articles have disregarded the essential points of the problem and have been misled by popular but antiquated discussions in the pursuit of will-o'-the-wisps of etymologies. Anything can be proved by the judicious use of etymologies and the fortuitous resemblances of words from different languages.

I Kings 10:11 reports that the navy of Hiram which brought gold from Ophir brought also from Ophir *almug* trees and precious stones. II Chron. 9:10 corresponds, but reads *algum* for *almug*, and does not say expressly that the *algum* trees came from Ophir. The reading of Kings (composed about 600 B.C.) is to be preferred to that of Chronicles (composed after 300 B.C.), unless it can be shown conclusively that *algum* must be correct and has been corrupted in the handing down of the text of Kings.¹ Torrey² remarks that the

¹ The word *almug* is repeated twice in I Kings 10:12; *algum* is repeated once in II Chron. 9:11. The two words undoubtedly refer to the same article. There is nothing surprising in the transposition of letters. But which is original?

² *Ezra Studies*, pp. 82-84.

Hebrew text of Chronicles used by the Greek translator (before 150 B.C., as proved by a passage of Eupolemos) was not particularly good, but had suffered considerably from careless copyists. *Almug* is at least as likely to be correct as *algum*. The reading *algum* is often assumed to be correct merely because of an entirely hypothetical comparison with Sanskrit *valguka*. The text of Kings itself may not have been preserved with complete accuracy, but unless this comparison can be shown conclusively to be valid it cannot be used to prove the superiority of the reading of Chronicles.

The Septuagint translates the word in I Kings 10:11 by ξύλα πελεκητά (L ἀπελέκητα), in II Chron. 9:10 by ξύλα πείκινα (L MSS 19, 108 ξύλα πείκινα ἀπελέκητα).¹ A few manuscripts of the Lucianic tradition (56, 93, 121) merely transliterate the word in Chronicles as γουγειμ or αγουγειμ.² Rahlfs³ reports from Theodoret the reading αγωγιμα. According to Field, Aquila had σούκινα and Symmachus had θύινα. It is noteworthy that none of the Lucianic manuscripts transliterate in I Kings 10:11.

If Olmstead's conclusions are correct⁴ the present text of Kings represents a complete post-Septuagintal revision of the old text; further, the Greek text is distinctly late, and the beginning and end of I Kings and all of II Kings come from Theodotion. Torrey⁵ argues that the present Greek text of Chronicles comes from Theodotion. The Greek of both books is decidedly late, and it is impossible to get back to the original readings. Did the Greek translators (or revisers) of Chronicles deduce πείκινα from II Chron. 2:8 as the translation of *algum* which best fitted the context there?⁶ In

¹ For the readings see Field's *Hexapla* and the editions of the Septuagint by Holmes and Parsons, Lagarde, Swete, and Tischendorf. For discussions see Kittel, *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 90; Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige*, I, 280-82, 296; Cheyne, *Expository Times*, IX, 470-73.

² MSS 93 adds ἀπελέκητα.

³ *Septuaginta-Studien*, I, 31. See also Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 70, 80. Torrey believes that these transliterations in the Lucianic tradition come from Theodotion. Did the remaining L manuscripts follow the ξύλα πείκινα of the other manuscripts, and is the addition of ἀπελέκητα due to a revision and comparison with I Kings 10:11 where L reads ἀπελέκητα; or was πείκινα inserted because of a revision to the reading of the other manuscripts in this passage?

⁴ *AJSL*, XXX, 26-27, 34-35, and XXXI, 169-70, 184, 204.

⁵ *Ezra Studies*, pp. 66 ff.

⁶ At any rate there must have been two independent translations of the word in the two passages. No good reason has yet been discovered for the translation found in Kings.

II Chron. 2:8 Solomon asks that cedar, cypress (fir?),¹ and *almug* trees be sent from Lebanon. The Septuagint here has *πέκινα* without variant. The parallel passage in I Kings 5:6 has only cedar, which is translated in the Septuagint by *ξύλα*.² In I Kings 5:8 and 10 cedar and cypress (fir?) are named; so also in I Kings 9:11.

If II Chron. 2:8 is correct the translation 'sandalwood' is impossible, for sandalwood could not have come from Lebanon.³ Is *almug* of II Chron. 2:8 an addition of the Chronicler to the original words?

It is noteworthy that there is no mention of *almug* in the detailed description of Solomon's building operations in I Kings, chapters 6-7, although in I Kings 6:15 cedar and cypress (fir?) are named specifically. Moreover, Eupolemos (second century B.C.), as quoted by Eusebius from Alexander Polyhistor,⁴ knew nothing of the use of *almug* trees in the construction of the temple. According to Freudenthal,⁵ Eupolemos used both the Septuagint and the Hebrew text, and based his discussion on Chronicles, but also tried to make a synthesis of the divergent accounts in Kings and Chronicles. Eupolemos reports that David gathered together and handed down to Solomon χρυσίον, ἀργύριον, χαλκόν, λίθους, ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα καὶ κέδρινα. II Chron. 2:7-8 and I Chron. 29:2, on which this passage is evidently based,⁶ have gold, silver, brass, iron, various precious stones, cedar, cypress (fir?), and *almug*. Eupolemos omits 'iron.' If he used here a Hebrew text and that text had *almug* it is strange that he should have omitted the precious wood, especially since he mentions cedar and cypress expressly. If he used the Greek text of

¹ See the remarks of Šanda, *op. cit.*, p. 105, on this uncertain word.

² See Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 54. Šanda, *op. cit.*, p. 103, thinks that 'wood' must have been the original reading, because in verses 8 and 10 two kinds of wood are mentioned. So also Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige*, pp. 28-29. Such strict logic is not necessary. Burney thinks that ξύλα is a correction made in order to accommodate this verse to verses 8 and 10.

³ For arguments on the basis of this passage, and II Chron. 9:10, that *almug* or *algum* did not come from Ophir at all, see Cheyne, *Expository Times*, IX, 472, and Šanda, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

⁴ As given by Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 226. For the date and writings of Eupolemos see Susemihl, *Gesch. Griech. Litt.*, II, 648-51; Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, II, 191; Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-30.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 108, 114, 119, 120, 126. See also Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 49, n., and 82; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 112-13.

⁶ II Chron. 2:7-8 omits the precious stones. I Chron. 29:2 omits cedar, cypress (fir?), and *almug*, and has merely 'wood.'

Chronicles he probably found ξύλα πεύκινα. Is this, together with cedar and cypress, reflected in his account merely by ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα καὶ κέδρινα? Did he find a third word at all? At any rate the omission is significant.

Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 7. 1) has ξύλων πευκίνων. The Vulgate has *pinea* in II Chron. 2:8, but in the other passages has *thyina* (a citron wood from Algiers). It is clear that there was no definite traditional interpretation of the word. The translations were merely guesses from the context.¹

Celsus (1748 A.D.) enumerates no less than fifteen different interpretations of *almug*,² and he himself was the first to suggest 'sandalwood.' Glaser³ has identified *almug* with the *ušû*-wood (styrax) of the Assyrian inscriptions. Cheyne⁴ identifies it with Assyrian *êlammâku*. Šanda⁵ suggests that *al* may be the Arabic article, and compares *gummîm* with Egyptian *kmj* (Herod. 2. 96 κόμμι).

Josephus, who was, so far as our evidence goes, the first to locate Ophir in India, did not see in the word the name of any distinctively Indian product. He blindly followed the 'pine wood' of the Septuagint. Pine wood all the way from India! If his identification of Ophir with India was based on any old Hebrew tradition it is strange that he did not also know some tradition which named Indian products among the articles brought from Ophir.

Lassen⁶ tried to support the translation 'sandalwood' by a comparison with Sanskrit *valgu* or *valguka*. Max Müller⁷ argued that Sanskrit *valgu(m)* was corrupted first to *algum* and then to *almug*. If *almug* be original, as is probable, the comparison has no validity whatever. The Sanskrit word *valgu* means 'beautiful,' and is never applied to sandalwood. As a noun (and that only in late lexicons) the only meaning the word has is 'goat.' The derivative *valguka*

¹ See Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. xxvii.

² *Hierob.*, I, 172.

³ *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, II, 358-64.

⁴ *Expository Times*, IX, 472; cf. *ibid.*, X, 239.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 281.

⁶ *Indische Alterthumskunde*, I, 538; followed by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, XIV, 404-5, and by many others.

⁷ *Science of Language*, I, 189.

'beautiful' is given the meaning 'sandalwood' only in late lexicons. The earliest Sanskrit word for sandalwood is *candana*, found first in Yaska's *Nirukta* 11. 5 (ca. 500 B.C.). There is not the slightest evidence that *valguka* was a name of sandalwood as early as the tenth century B.C. Sandalwood is unknown to the Rig Veda.

Caldwell¹ compared to Sanskrit *valguka* the Tamil-Malayālam word *aragu* or *alagu* 'beautiful,' but there is no evidence that the word was ever used as a name for sandalwood.

The translation 'sandalwood' is based on no old Hebrew tradition. It is a guess from as late a date as 1748 A.D., and is supported by an utterly unconvincing comparison with a Sanskrit word used metaphorically at a late date to mean sandalwood. The conclusion is obvious.

I Kings 10:22 reports that Solomon had at sea 'ships of Tharshish' with the navy of Hiram and that once in three years they returned bringing gold and silver, ivory and apes (if *ṣenhabbīm* and *qophīm* mean that), and *thukkiyyīm*. II Chron. 9:21 corresponds except that the ships are said to have sailed to Tharshish. The Septuagint renders *ṣenhabbīm*, *qophīm*, and *thukkiyyīm* of I Kings 10:22 by λίθων τορευτῶν καὶ πελεκητῶν. Some seven minuscules, including the most important manuscripts of the Lucianic tradition, have ἀπελεκητῶν.² Of the old manuscripts, A alone has ὀδόντων ἐλεφαντίων καὶ πιθήκων καὶ ταῶνων.³

The same three words in II Chron. 9:21 are rendered by ὀδόντων ἐλεφαντίνων καὶ πιθήκων. Even A agrees (omitting καὶ ταῶνων, which it gives in the parallel passage of Kings). Of the manuscripts of the Lucianic tradition 19 and 108 add καὶ τεχειμ, 93 adds καὶ τεκχειμ, and 158 adds καὶ τεκχημ.⁴ In the margin of 108 the word σφιγγῶν (93 has σφινγι) is given by way of interpretation. In 158 this word is taken into the text. The word is the name of a species of Ethiopian monkey, and was doubtless suggested by the preceding word πιθήκων.

¹ *Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, ed. 2 (1875), p. 461; ed. 3 (1913), p. 574.

² The same variant occurs in the translation of *almug* (*algum*) in I Kings 10:11 and II Chron. 9:10.

³ Notice that B and L agree. For the affinity of B and L see Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 290-91, and Moore, *AJSL*, XXIX, 61.

⁴ Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 70, 80, thinks that this transcription in the Lucianic tradition comes from Theodotion.

A is far less trustworthy than B for the text of Kings, for A seems to have been revised by a comparison with the Hebrew text.¹ As in the case of *almug* (*alqum*) there is a curious discrepancy in the Greek translations of the same Hebrew words (at least in our Massoretic text) in the two parallel passages. This fact in itself arouses the suspicion that the translators were not in possession of any certain traditional interpretation of the meaning of the words themselves. The Septuagint is in general of very little assistance in the matter of obscure Hebrew words. Kings and Chronicles were much read and much revised. Both the present Greek and Hebrew texts are late and uncertain. The relation of the present Greek text of Kings to the present Greek text of Chronicles, and the relation of both to the Massoretic and pre-Massoretic Hebrew texts, are questions of great difficulty.²

Several minuscules and two or three of the versions show 'mixed readings' in I Kings 10:22 (a combination of the readings of the B type and of the A type), 'hewn and carved stones' plus 'ivory and apes' (or 'ivory, apes, and peacocks').³ This seems to be a later Hexaplaric synthesis and an effort to unify the two traditions. The long combined reading cannot be original as a translation of the three Hebrew words. If it is true that A was revised and unified (for Kings) by a comparison with the Massoretic text it is impossible that the original Greek texts of Kings and Chronicles could have had 'ivory, apes, and peacocks' in both places. Torrey may be right in his general estimate of A for Chronicles, but there A and B agree

¹ See Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp. xiii-xiv; Šanda, *op. cit.*, pp. xiii; Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 487-89, 529-30; Hrozný, *Die Abweichungen des Codex Vaticanus vom Hebräischen Texte in den Königsbüchern*; Moore, *AJSL*, XXIX, 55 ff.; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 129-30; Silberstein, *ZATW*, 1893, pp. 5 ff., and 1894, p. 26; Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXX, 25-26, and XXXI, 170-74. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 91-96, argues that A is by far the best manuscript for Chronicles, and that B has been much revised and is full of Hexaplar readings. Even if this conclusion is correct, it by no means applies to Kings. There was no unified original Greek translation of the Old Testament. There were independent translations of single books or groups of books. The text of each book must be treated on its own merits. Torrey's conclusions are supported by Procksch, *Septuaginta-Studien*, p. 59, for the text of the Prophets.

² See in general Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, pp. xix ff.; Šanda, *op. cit.*, pp. xii ff.; Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp. xiii ff.; Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 320, 439, 445-46; Moore, *AJSL*, XXIX, 51 ff.; Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXX, 2, 26-27, 30, 34-35, and XXXI, 188 ff.; Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 63 ff.; Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 61-62, 126-27.

³ See Holmes and Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*; Field's *Hexapla*; Silberstein, *ZATW*, 1894, pp. 5-6.

in this passage, and neither has 'peacocks.' Has B been revised to A in this passage of Chronicles? Did it originally have another reading? If A is correct in Kings there is no good way of accounting for λίθων τορευτῶν καὶ πελεκητῶν of B as a mere textual corruption.¹ The variant must be based on a real difference of opinion and intention. The transliteration of the Lucianic manuscripts increases the suspicion that there was no certain traditional interpretation of the word *thukkiyyīm* as 'peacocks.' Whoever made the transcription (Theodotion according to Torrey) knew no such tradition. If he found any general agreement among the manuscripts in reading ταῶνων it is not likely that he would have questioned the word.²

Is it certain that the Massoretic text of these two parallel passages reflects the Hebrew original, or even that the original Hebrew texts of Kings and Chronicles had the same words in the two passages?³ Is the Massoretic uniformity due to a revision or do the wide discrepancies of the Greek texts merely imply two different guesses by the Greek translators?⁴ Is the omission of καὶ ταῶνων (in Chronicles) merely a scribal error in A? One of the Hebrew words seems to be omitted. Is the same true of B, which (in Chronicles) has 'ivory and apes' and omits *thukkiyyīm*? If 'peacocks' was in the original Greek texts of Kings and Chronicles it is unbelievable that it should be missing in the B tradition in both passages, doubted by the Lucianic tradition in Chronicles and omitted in Kings, and found only once in the A tradition. No good explanation has yet been

¹ Šanda, *op. cit.*, p. 287, thinks that πελεκητῶν of B is merely a corruption of πηθήκων of A. There is nothing in favor of this suggestion, and no explanation is offered for the corruption of δδόντων ελεφαντίνων το λίθων τορευτῶν and for the omission of ταῶνων.

² For the value of the Lucianic tradition see Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXI, 171; Moore, *AJSL*, XXIX, 54-62; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 290-95. According to Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 102-3, 105 ff., the value of L is slight, for it has been extensively conformed to the Massoretic text, its Greek has been very much contaminated from other Greek texts, and it shows conflation from various sources. Cf. Procksch, *Septuaginta-Studien*, p. 87, for the value of L in the Prophets. At present it is impossible to reach the Ur-Lucian, and the general value of the present Lucianic text is uncertain.

³ Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 238-39, concludes that, in this portion of Kings, B represents a translation from a recension older than the Massoretic text, and that, for this portion of Kings, A represents the Hexaplar Greek. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXI, 188 ff., discusses the disorder of the Massoretic text of Kings, and *ibid.*, p. 201, argues for a revision of the present Hebrew text of Kings to that of Chronicles in post-Quinta times.

⁴ For the "guesses" of the Greek translators see Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 38-40, 76. I have even less confidence in the Greek of our passages than in the Hebrew, although the evidence of Josephus, to be discussed later, seems to point strongly to the conclusion that the Hebrew is corrupt.

given for the B and L translations of the three Hebrew words in the passage of Kings. It is most unlikely that it can be due merely to a corruption of the text, and there is not the slightest reason for thinking that it is due to a later revision and correction of the A reading by B. There were probably two independent translations, and the A reading in Kings is due to a later revision. However, as will be seen presently, the translation 'ivory and apes' is as old as the time of Josephus. Josephus does not have 'peacocks.'

Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 7. 2) furnishes information on the passages in question which is much earlier than the date of our present Greek or Hebrew texts. He translates *ἐλέφας Αἰθιοπές τε καὶ πῖθηκοι*. Whether he followed the interpretation of II Chron. 9:21, or for some other reason, he states that the ships sailed *εἰς τὰ ἐνδοτέρω τῶν ἔθνων*, and does not bring this voyage into connection with Ophir and India as he does the other voyage (*Ant.* 8. 7. 1). If Josephus here followed a Greek text that text could not have had *καὶ ταῶνων*.¹ If he followed a Hebrew text that text must have had a different reading from our Massoretic one, or if it did have *thukkiyyīm* Josephus did not understand the word, and emended or guessed. It has been suggested that he read *sukkiyyīm* for *thukkiyyīm*. The word occurs in II Chron. 12:3 and is translated by the Septuagint as *Τρογλοδύται*.² Josephus certainly knew no tradition which included peacocks among the imports from Ophir. If he had he would surely have made India the goal of this voyage too.

The Vulgate, the Peshitto, the Targums, and the Arabic translation render *thukkiyyīm* by 'peacocks.' Oppert³ argues that Josephus and the translators of the Septuagint did not know the true meaning

¹ Swete, *Introduction*, p. 379, on the basis of A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*, concludes that the text of the Septuagint used by Josephus had no affinity with the B text, but followed the Ur-Lucian text. If so, what did the Ur-Lucian have for the *τεχέμ* of our present Lucianic manuscripts, which according to Torrey is the transliteration of Theodotion? Against Mez see the strictures of Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 92-103, 111; Moore, *AJSJ*, XXIX, 59; Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 102-3; Šanda, *op. cit.*, pp. xviii-xix.

² See Bochart, *Geographia Sacra*, ed. 4 (1707), p. 138; Oppert, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXV, 247-49; Stade-Schwally, *The Books of Kings* (in the Polychrome Bible), p. 119; Šanda, *op. cit.*, pp. 289-90; Niebuhr, *OLZ*, III, 69; W. M. Müller, *OLZ*, III, 269; Winckler, *OLZ*, IV, 148; Glaser, *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, Munich, 1902, No. 271, pp. 370 ff., referred to by Döller, *Geographische und ethnographische Studien zum III. und IV. Bücher der Könige*, p. 149.

³ *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXV, 224.

of the words, but that Jerome and the Targums followed an old, reliable tradition and translated correctly. But, as Burney remarks,¹ the Targums have a tendency to paraphrase and to insert explanatory remarks without any equivalent in the original. They are almost negligible for the reconstruction of the original text. Jerome in I Kings 10:11 and II Chron. 9:11 translates *almug* (*algum*) by *thyina*, while in II Chron. 2:8 he translates the same word by *pinea*. For this obscure word he had no certain traditional interpretation. Is it likely that he had a certain traditional interpretation for the equally obscure word *thukkiyyīm*? Moreover, the Targums and the Peshitto merely transliterate *qophīm* without translation.² Is it likely that they were in possession of any certain traditional interpretation of the following word *thukkiyyīm*? Oppert's treatment of the evidence is subjective and arbitrary.

Eupolemos, who lived in the second century B.C., has the following striking passage,³ preserved by Eusebius from Alexander Polyhistor in Praep. Evang. 9. 30: ἀκούσαντα δὲ τὸν Δαβὶδ πλοῖα ναυπηγῆσαι ἐν Ἑλάνοις πόλει τῆς Ἀραβίας, καὶ πέμψαι μεταλλευτὰς εἰς τὴν Οὐφρῇ νῆσον κειμένην ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ, μέταλλα χρυσικὰ ἔχουσαν. καὶ τὸ χρυσίον ἐκέλευεν μετακομίσαι τοὺς μεταλλευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. This passage may be based on I Chron. 29:4, which states that David had prepared for the building of the temple 'three thousand talents of gold, of the gold of Ophir.' The authority of Eupolemos for locating Οὐφρῇ in the Red Sea⁴ is unknown.⁵ Bochart emended to Οὐρφῇ and identified it with Ophir. This emendation and identification with Ophir are doubtless correct. Whatever may have been the source of Eupolemos for the location of Ophir and whatever we may believe about his reliability as a historian, it is clear that he knew no tradition which, in the second century B.C., connected Ophir with

¹ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, pp. xxxi-xxxii. See also Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 56; Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXI, 173.

² Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 149.

³ Text in Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 226.

⁴ The term "Red Sea" was used loosely and was by no means restricted to what we now call the Red Sea.

⁵ *Geographia Sacra*, ed. 4 (1707), p. 138. Keane, *The Gold of Ophir*, p. 226, ascribes the emendation to Gesenius. See also Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 210; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 112-13; Döllner, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-51; Oppert, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXV, 238.

India. Keane¹ rules Eupolemos out of court entirely as untrustworthy because he was an "obscure writer." Some better reason than that must be found if the passage is to be disregarded entirely. Did Eupolemos have I Kings 10:11-12 and 21-22 and II Chron. 9:10-11 and 21 at all in the text which lay before him? He makes no mention of *almug* (*algum*), 'ivory, apes, and peacocks.' Of course he may have singled out gold as being the most important product of the voyages to Ophir. The omission is significant, although not conclusive.

Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 6. 4) refers to Ophir in the following words: Σώφειραν, νῦν δὲ χρυσὴν γῆν καλουμένην (τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἐστὶν αὕτη). In another passage (*Ant.* 1. 1. 3) he identifies the river Pison with the Ganges.² In a third passage (*Ant.* 1. 6. 4), which refers to Gen. 10:29, he says: Οὗτοι ἀπὸ Κωφῆνος ποταμοῦ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτῇ Ἀρίας τινὰ κατονκοῦσι. In the Old Testament the name India is found first in Esther (1:1 and 8:9) and in I Esdras (3:2).³ The dates are uncertain, but the texts are probably not earlier than the third century B.C. The name Golden Land (or Golden Island), later described as a peninsula and called the Golden Chersonese, came into the limelight at precisely the time when Josephus was writing. We can trace the development of the accurate knowledge of India and of the idea of India as a fabled land of gold from Pomponius Mela (3. 7. 7), Pliny (*N.H.* 6. 55), and the *Periplus* (63) to Marinus of Tyre (ca. 100 A.D.) and Ptolemy.⁴ Is it not significant that the first identification of Ophir with India should come from precisely this time? Is it not likely to be due to more than a mere coincidence? India is a land of gold, the river Pison 'which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold' (Gen. 2:11) is identified with the Ganges; it is thought that the sons of Shem colonized India; and the new geographic knowledge is used freely as an aid in the interpretation of the Old Testament.

¹ *The Gold of Ophir*, pp. 149, 226.

² This identification is frequently repeated later. See, for instance, Ambrose, in *Patrologia Latina*, XIV, 296; Jerome, *ibid.*, XXII, 1074, and XXIII, 938; Augustine, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 203; Epiphanius, in *Patrologia Graeca*, XLIII, 119.

³ For the passage of Esdras see Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, p. 50.

⁴ Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen*, ed. 2 (1903), pp. 586, 606 ff.

In Gen. 10:29 it is said that Ophir and the other sons of Joktan dwelt near Σωφηρὰ (Σωφάρὰ), ὄρος Ἀνατολῶν. Compare with this the passage of Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 6. 4) quoted above. In several passages where Ophir is mentioned the name occurs in several different spellings with a prefixed Σ. It has been suggested that this spelling is due to a dittography from the preceding εἰς.¹ Oppert² argues that the unaspirated vowel became weakly aspirated and that the aspirate then became S. This would be the reverse of the process by which Sindhu became Ἰνδός. There is, however, much to be said in favor of the suggestion³ that the point of departure was the passage Gen. 10:29–30, which states that Ophir dwelt near Sopheira, a mountain of the east. As India came into prominence as a land of gold, the fact that gold was obtained from Ophir and that Ophir dwelt in the east near a mountain named Sopheira, and the fact that the Pison, identified with the Ganges, surrounded the land of Havilah where there was gold, were made the point of departure for locating Ophir in India and for the spelling of the name with a Σ. Note also the significant passage of Jerome.⁴ *Sophera, quae est et Sophir, unde veniebant naves Salomonis. Est enim mons Orientis pertinens ad Indiae regionem.* The argument of Kircher,⁵ that the Coptic word for India (Sophir) proves that originally in old Egyptian the word Ophir had an initial S, is fallacious. Coptic is so late and so much dependent on Greek that the word Sophir was certainly borrowed from the Greek form with prefixed S.⁶

Gesenius⁷ supported the translation of *thukkiyyim* as 'peacock' by a comparison with *tokei*, a Dravidian word for 'peacock.' Lassen⁸ further adduced the Sanskrit word *śikhin*, from which he assumed that the Dravidian word *tokei* was derived (mit Dekhanischer Aussprache). These comparisons have met with almost universal

¹ Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, III, 100.

² *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXV, 232.

³ Keane, *The Gold of Ophir*, pp. 53, 207.

⁴ *Patrologia Latina*, XXIII, 970.

⁵ *Prodromos Aegyptiacus* (1636), p. 115; followed by several later scholars.

⁶ See the Coptic grammars of Stern, Steindorff, and Mallon. The evidence is conclusive.

⁷ *Wörterbuch* (1834).

⁸ *Indische Alterthumskunde*, I, 438 (1847). Followed by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, XIV, 402 (1848), and popularized by Max Müller, *The Science of Language*, I, 190–91.

acceptance. Caldwell¹ reported that the ordinary Tamil word for 'peacock' was *mayil* (from Sanskrit *mayūra*), that the peacock was sometimes called *śiki* (from Sanskrit *śikhin*), but that the old word was *tōkei*, pronounced *tōgei* and derived from a root meaning 'to hang.' The existence of the word *śiki* invalidates the derivation of *tokei* from Sanskrit *śikhin*. *Tokei* is an epithet meaning 'the bird with a hanging tail.' *Śikhin* is an epithet meaning 'the crested bird.' The two words are not related.² The earliest Sanskrit word for 'peacock' is *mayūra*, which is found in the Rig Veda.³ *Śikhin*, used metaphorically to denote the peacock, occurs first in the Prātiśākhya of the Rig Veda (ca. 600 B.C.). There is no evidence that the word was so used in the tenth century B.C. At present Tamil is without a chronological backbone, and we have no historical dictionary. Caldwell, much too conservatively, dated no piece of Tamil literature before the tenth century A.D. There is now a growing tendency, as Tamil literature is studied more critically, to regard the second and third centuries A.D. as the great period of Tamil history and literature.⁴ However that may be, there is not the slightest proof that the word *tokei* was used in the sense of 'peacock' in the tenth century B.C. We know nothing about Southern India until the time of Aśoka (third century B.C.), not even whether the Tamil people dwelt, in the tenth century B.C., in that part of India now inhabited by them. At present the comparison of *thukkiiyīm* with *tokei* is of no historical value.

Greek *ταῶς* or *ταῶς*, Attic *ταῶς* (according to Trypho *apud* Athenaeus 9. 397e), has by almost universal consent been derived from the Hebrew word *thukkiiyīm*,⁵ and confirmation is found therein for the belief that 'peacock' is the true meaning of the latter. The Greek word is usually transliterated *tahos*, but the rough breathing really

¹ *Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, ed. 2 (1875), pp. 91–92; ed. 3 (1913), p. 88.

² For a careful discussion of the Dravidian words for 'peacock' see Vinson, *Revue de linguistique*, III, 120–28. See also Weber, *Skizze*, p. 74, n.; Oppert, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXV, 246.

³ See Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 90; Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, II, 134.

⁴ See Vincent Smith, *The Early History of India*, ed. 3 (1914), pp. 438 ff.; Pillai, *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*; Aiyangar, *Ancient India* (especially pp. 336 ff.); K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer, *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan*, pp. 82–94.

⁵ See Hahn, *Die Haustiere*, p. 317; Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, ed. 7, p. 349, ed. 8, p. 355; Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, II, 152; Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, pp. 164–67.

stands for a digamma. The right transliteration would seem to be *tavos*. The *h* seems to give a fictitious approximation to the Hebrew word. The linguistic resemblance between *tavos* and *thukkiyyīm* is slight. Compare the close transcription *τεχειμ* of the Lucianic manuscripts. I can see no plausible explanation for the conversion of *thukkiyyīm* into *tavos* by any possible phonetics. To be sure, words taken into one language from another often show strange changes, but there is always some sort of phonetic approximation.

Lewy¹ connects the Greek words with Hebrew *ta' āwā* 'Begehrs-würdiges, Anziehendes.' Halévy² thinks that the Greek word is derived from Aramaic *tawus*, which comes from *tawsā* 'volant, volatile.'

The peacock was known in Athens toward the end of the fifth century B.C., and there is good reason for believing that it came to Athens from Samos, where it was used in the cult of Hera.³ Did it come to Samos from Palestine, Phoenicia, or Babylon? As yet no representation of the peacock on Assyrian monuments seems to be known. Meissner⁴ suggests that the peacock may be intended in a description of wonderful birds 'deren Schwingen blau gefärbt waren' received as tribute by Tiglath-Pileser (738 B.C.), but no name for the birds is given, nor is the place from which they came mentioned.

The Baveru Jātaka relates how a peacock (*mora* from Sanskrit *mayūra*) was taken to a place called Baveru (suspected of being Babiru, Babylon).⁵ The story may possibly reflect events of the fifth or sixth centuries B.C. The identification with Babylon is credible, but is not certain.⁶

¹ *Die Semitischen Fremdwörter in Griechischen*, p. 11.

² *Journal asiatique*, II (1913), 710-13.

³ See the discussions of Hahn, Hehn, Keller, and Thompson referred to above.

⁴ *OLZ*, 1913, pp. 292-93; cf. Laufer, *ibid.*, pp. 539-40.

⁵ See Minayeff, *Mélanges asiatiques*, VI (1871), 577-79; Kennedy, *JRAS*, 1898, p. 269; Chavannes, *T'oung Pao*, 1913, p. 791; Halévy, *Revue sémitique*, 1895, pp. 268-75.

⁶ The material for the following note was given to me by Berthold Laufer, of the Field Museum. It may be of general interest, although it does not bear directly on the present problem. The annals of the later Han dynasty (*Hou Han shu*, chap. 118) state with reference to the country *T'iao-ti*: "This country is hot and moist; it produces lions, rhinoceros, humped oxen (zebu), peacocks, and giant birds (ostriches)"; cf. Hirth, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 38; Chavannes, "Les pays d'occident d'après le Hou Han Chou," *T'oung Pao*, 1907, p. 176. Hirth has treated the text also in *Syrisch-chinesische Beziehungen*, appendix to R. Oberhummer and Zimmerer, *Durch Syrien und*

Recently Clay¹ has reported that among the accounts of the Babylonian merchants Murashu and Sons (fifth century B.C.) there is a reference to a settlement of Hi-in-da-ai, and has suggested that the passage refers to a settlement of Indians in Babylon at that time. If so, the fact would furnish an easy explanation of the presence of peacocks in Athens at the end of the fifth century. After the conquest of Northwestern India by Darius at the end of the sixth century B.C. there seems to have been much intercourse between India and Persia.

Further, Petrie reproduces several terra-cotta heads from the foreign quarter of Memphis which seem to represent Indians.² He ascribes them to the period between 500 and 200 B.C. The identification of the figures as Indian is very probable.

Persian *tāūs* 'peacock' has not yet been traced back into Middle or Old Persian so far as I know. Is it an early Persian word or is it borrowed from the Greek? Is the same true of Arabic *tāwus*? Horn³ suggests that *tāvus* (also a Persian form) means 'bird' in general, and thinks that the same may be true of Latin *pavus*. This is not probable. Lagarde⁴ suggests that *ταῶς* may be a mistake for *παῶς*,⁵ and that this is an older form of the Armenian word *hav* 'bird.' But it seems that Armenian *hav* is connected etymologically with Latin *avis* and that the *h* is not original.⁶ Muss-Arnolt⁷ refers to Möhl, *Mém.*, VII, 420, rem. 4 for Tataric *ta'uq* 'peacock.' The reference seems to be wrong. At any rate the information is incorrect. Radloff (III, col. 987) gives *tavus* or *tawys* as the Turkish

Kleinasien. *T'iao-či* is usually translated "Chaldea" (cf. Hirth, *op. cit.*, pp. 144 ff.). Chavannes regards it as the Arabic kingdom Characene founded between 180 and 127 B.C. in Mesene at the mouth of the Tigris. A spontaneous occurrence of the peacock in the Tigris Valley is out of the question; perhaps the domesticated birds, transported there from India, were released and reverted to the wild state. The text, if the reading of the Han annals is correct, merely proves that in the first century of the Christian Era peacocks were known in the lower Tigris region. At that time the Chinese were familiar with the bird from Indo-China.

¹ *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, X, viii.

² *Memphis I*, Pl. 39 and pp. 16-17; *Meydum and Memphis III*, Fig. 149 and p. 46.

³ *IF*, II, 141.

⁴ *Baktrische Lexicographie*, p. 65.

⁵ The Latin and Greek words may be merely linguistic variants of one original form. See Wood, *Classical Philology*, XIV, 268.

⁶ See Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, p. 465; Liden, *Armenische Studien*, p. 83; Meillet, *MSLP*, VII, 162; F. Müller, *WZKM*, VIII, 282.

⁷ *Trans. Am. Phil. Asso.*, 1892, p. 100.

word for 'peacock.' *Tavuk*, *tawyk*, or *tauk* means 'chicken.' Hüsing¹ gives *thaus* or *thavus* as the common word for 'peacock' in the languages of the Caucasus. Dialectic forms are *thataguš*, *tütükuš*, and *thauskuš*.

The origin of all these forms which resemble the Greek word so closely, and are undoubtedly connected with it, is uncertain, and the center from which the borrowing took place cannot yet be determined. The clue may eventually be found in Babylonia, unless Halévy is right in deriving the word from Aramaic, or Lewy in deriving it from Hebrew. It is extremely doubtful whether any of these words has any connection with *thukkiyyīm*, even assuming that that form is correct.

The available evidence seems to show that there was no certain tradition among the Hebrews that Ophir was located in India or that *thukkiyyīm* (if that reading be correct) meant 'peacock.' Eupolemos, in the second century B.C., was ignorant of any such tradition. The identification of Ophir with India by Josephus was made at precisely the time when India had become famous as a land of gold. In the face of the evidence presented above it is most unlikely that Jerome and the Targums preserved any old tradition, which, running subterraneously for centuries, came to the surface for the first time in the third and fourth centuries A.D. and found literary expression then for the first time. It is much more likely that they merely copied the current opinion. It was the identification of Ophir with India (both being lands of gold) which led to the effort to identify the obscure Hebrew word with the name of some Indian product. By the time of Josephus 'ivory and apes' had been fixed upon by at least one school of interpreters as the meaning of *šenhabbīm qophīm*. Those who believed that the voyage of I Kings 10:21-22 was to India sought in the third obscure word the name of some Indian animal to correspond to the elephants and apes, and fixed upon the famous and prized Indian bird. The peacock was all the rage in Rome during the early Empire. Note that the 'pine wood' of the Septuagint (II Chron. 2:8) is obviously a guess based on the preceding words 'cedar and cypress (fir?)', and that in three Lucianic manuscripts *τεχειμ* is explained by a gloss, based on the context, as

¹ OLZ, 1914, p. 301.

referring to a species of monkey from Ethiopia. With this tautology 'apes and monkeys' and with the 'Ethiopians' of Josephus compare the Egyptian account of an expedition to Punt which brought back, among other things, 'apes and monkeys' and 'natives and their children.'¹

It is believed by many careful students of the Hebrew text that the verses in which the words *šenhabbīm*, *qophīm*, and *thukkīyyīm* occur are later additions to the original Hebrew text. If the reading *thukkīyyīm* is correct, and if the comparison with Dravidian *tokei* is valid, the verses may have been added to the Hebrew text some time after the sixth century B.C., when the peacock was known in Palestine. Per se there is no serious objection to the comparison of *thukkīyyīm* to *tokei*. But there is good reason to doubt the reading *thukkīyyīm* and it is very doubtful chronologically whether we can assume that *tokei* was used to denote the peacock in the tenth or even in the sixth century B.C.

The earliest certain evidence for navigation on the Indian Ocean is that found in a passage of Herodotus (4. 44). Toward the end of the sixth century B.C., Darius sent the Greek Skylax on an expedition across Persia, down the Indus by boat, and along the coast of Persia and Arabia to Arsinoe (near Suez).² After this voyage of exploration Darius conquered the northwestern part of India and 'made use of that sea.' However, it is certain that the Indian Brāhmī alphabet was borrowed from some Semitic alphabet.³ This implies commercial intercourse with the West. Bühler argues for 800 B.C. as the date of the borrowing. Kennedy argues for 600 B.C. None of the Indian evidence for the existence of writing can be dated with certainty before the fourth or fifth centuries B.C.⁴ The earliest Greek evidence is Nearchus *apud* Strabo (15. 1. 67). That is 325 B.C. The earliest Indian inscriptions come from the third century B.C. There is no way of dating the initial borrowing, and it is not yet certain whether

¹ Breasted, *Records*, II, 109.

² See Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen*, pp. 61, 73-74; Reese, *Die Griechischen Nachrichten über Indien*, pp. 39-52.

³ See Bühler, *On the Origin of the Indian Brāhma Alphabet and Indische Palaeographie*, p. 17 (in *Grundriss der Indo-arischen Philologie*); Kennedy, *JRAS*, 1898, pp. 274-75.

⁴ See Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 107 ff.

the model was a North Semitic or a South Semitic alphabet.¹ This evidence is not sufficient to cover the gap between the sixth century and the tenth century B.C. Does the word *thukkiyyīm* do so? In the light of the evidence presented above this seems to me very doubtful. A priori it is perfectly possible that there may have been navigation on the Indian Ocean as early as the tenth century B.C., but history in its reconstruction of the past must proceed on the basis of certain fact, not on the basis of what may or may not have been possible.

Discussion of the emendations which have been proposed for the words *šenhabbīm*, *qophīm*, and *thukkiyyīm*, and of the other identifications such as 'parrots' and 'guinea fowl' which have been proposed for *thukkiyyīm*, has been purposely omitted.

The text criticism of the Old Testament is entirely outside of my own field. These jottings and suggestions have been made in the hope that some Old Testament scholar may be induced to subject the passages under discussion to a more searching textual criticism. The Ethiopic versions, for instance, are beyond my reach.

¹ W. Max Müller has recently argued (*OLZ*, 1912, p. 541), contrary to the generally accepted view, that the model was a South Semitic alphabet.